

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over GOODMAN (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,929) in view of WINSHELL (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099813). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Through the present amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 12, 17, 18, 20, and 21 to improve form; cancel claims 2, 9, 10, 14, and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer; and add new claims 23-27. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, and 16-27 are pending.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL

Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For example, GOODMAN and WINSHELL do not disclose or suggest the feature in amended independent claim 1 of generating, by a processor associated with the computer system, a second plurality of different URLs including, respectively, different parameter combinations of a selected one or more parameters, where the parameter combinations include each combination of the selected one or more parameters. With respect to previously presented claim 1, the Examiner alleges that generating, by a processor associated with the computer system, a second plurality of different URLs having different parameter combinations of the one or more selected parameter is disclosed in GOODMAN at col. 6, line 62- col. 7, line 5 (Office Action at pages 3 and 4).

Without acquiescing in this rejection, Applicants submit that this section of GOODMAN does not disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 1, as amended.

At col. 6, line 62- col. 7, line 5, GOODMAN states:

Since, as described above, a single Web page can be identified by different links, it will be desirable to determine when multiple links, which can be associated with the same and/or multiple classes, in fact identify the same Web page. To accomplish that operation, the Web page analyzer 15 converts each link to the canonical form, using URL "re-write rules" that it develops and stores in the URL re-write rulebase 16B. The Web page analyzer 15 generates the re-write rules as it analyzes Web pages received from the spider 14.

This section of GOODMAN discloses, for example, that a web page analyzer 15 finds a pair of matching Web pages in a cache and applies existing re-write rules to the corresponding URLs to determine if the URLs can be made identical. If the existing re-write rules do not result in identical URLs, the web page analyzer 15 generates a new re-write rule by finding a substitution that turns one of the URLs into the other URL. See also GOODMAN at col. 7, line 24 to col. 8, line 53.

This section of GOODMAN does not disclose or suggest generating, by a processor associated with the computer system, a second plurality of different URLs including, respectively, different parameter combinations of the selected one or more parameters, where the parameter combinations include each combination of the selected one or more parameter, as recited in claim 1. Rather, as described above, this section of GOODMAN discloses forming re-write rules based on identifying URLs associated with matching Web pages and applying or forming re-write rules to convert a first known URL to a second known URL when the first and second URLs are associated with matching Web pages.

Moreover, col 7, lines 24-28 and 41-50 of GOODMAN discloses, for example, that when a candidate URL is formed by eliminating portions at the beginning and/or the end of the World Wide Web address. This methodology, of eliminating portions at the beginning and/or end of the a URL could not conceivably correspond to the parameter combinations including each combination of the selected one or more parameters, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, this section of GOODMAN does not disclose or suggest generating, by a processor associated with the computer system, a second plurality of different URLs including, respectively, different parameter combinations of a selected one or more parameters, where the parameter combinations include each combination of the selected one or more parameters, as recited in amended claim 1.

The disclosure in WINSHELL does not cure these deficiencies in the disclosure of GOODMAN with respect to the above-identified features of claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claims 7, 12, 17, and 18 recite features similar to features discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 7, 12, 17, and 18 are patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7, 12, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from claim 7. Therefore, this claim is patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 16 depends from claim 12. Therefore, this claim is patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 21 depend from claim 17. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 22 depend from claim 18. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GOODMAN and WINSHELL for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to

claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on GOODMAN and WINSHELL be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 23-27 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1, 7, 12, 17, and 18 and are, therefore, allowable over the references applied in the Office Action for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 7, 12, 17, and 18.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the proposed pending claims.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070

and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /David D. Nelson, Reg. No. 47818/

David D. Nelson
Registration No. 47,818

Date: March 23, 2010
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44989